IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.111 OF 2007

1.M/s.Arihant Agro Corporation,
2.Mr.Tarachand Liladhar Khona, &
3.Mr.Ramesh Nandlal Shah. ...Petitioners.

Versus

1. Mr.Mayank Kantilal Shah, &
2. The State of Maharashtra. ...Respondents.

....

Mr.G.M.Joshi, Adv. for the Petitioners.
Mr.K.V.Saste, APP, for the State.
Mr.K.N.Bhatia, Adv. for Respondent No.1.

....

CORAM : SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.

DATED : 4th May, 2007.

P.C.:

1. Heard the learned Advocate for the petitioners-orig.accused, the learned Advocate for respondent No.1-orig.complainant and the learned APP for the State.

2. By judgment and order dated 3.5.2005 passed in Criminal Case No.349/SS/2005 the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, 31st Court, Vikhroli, Mumbai, convicted the petitioners-orig.accused for the offence under Section 138 of N.I.Act, and sentenced them to suffer RI for one year. Being

aggrieved thereby, the petitioners preferred Appeal before the Sessions Court. During pendency of the Appeal, the petitioners preferred an application under Section 391 of Cr.P.C.. The said applicant was decided against the petitioners. Hence, this Revision has been preferred.

3. During pendency of this Revision, the parties have arrived at consent terms. The consent terms, which have been tendered in Court, are taken on record and marked "X" for identification.

4. Revision Application is disposed of in terms of consent terms.

5. By consent, it is made clear that if the amount as mentioned in the consent terms is not paid to the complainant within the time period specified in the consent terms, this order shall automatically vacated and this Revision Application will stand dismissed.

(SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.)